

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This submission accompanies an RCE and serves as a further response to the Final Office Action of July 19, 2006 and Advisory Action issued December 26, 2006 in connection with the instant application. A Petition for Extension of Time (three months) and the fee therefor are submitted herewith.

Claims 1-11 are the claims currently pending in the present application.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8 and 9 are amended to clarify features recited thereby.

The Request for Reconsideration filed on October 6, 2006 was fully responsive to the Office Action mailed July 19, 2006 and no further amendment of the claims is required to overcome the cited references. However, in the interest of expediting prosecution of the present application, recitations of the claims are further clarified.

Independent claims 1, 2, 5, 8 and 9 both in their amended and unamended form, require that the radio base station (or the external control unit connected to the base station, per claims 2 and 9, or the like) responds to a broadcast packet concerning a physical address inquiry addressed to the radio mobile terminal that the base station receives over a communication line.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's citation of the portion of Novakov relating to the local station 10 sending inquiry messages at steps 50A, 50B, . . . , 50X at regular time intervals in order to find and identify a mobile station 26 within the range of the Bluetooth link is irrelevant to the above-cited feature of applicant's claimed invention. As discussed in the Request for Reconsideration, claims 1, 2, 5, 8 and 9 require that the radio base station respond to the broadcast packet addressed to the radio mobile terminal as an agent for the radio mobile terminal. Novakov, on the other hand, is directed to establishing communication between the local station 10 and the mobile station 26 according to the Bluetooth standard, and is silent with respect to the radio base station acting as an agent for responding to a broadcast packet addressed to the radio mobile terminal received by the radio base station over the communication line. Accordingly, Novakov does not disclose or suggest the recitations of claims 1, 2, 5, 8 and 9.

Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 10 and 11 depend from the foregoing claims and are therefore patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

In view of the foregoing discussion, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims and pass this case to issue.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
EFS FILING SYSTEM
ON JANUARY 19, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



MAX MOSKOWITZ

Registration No.: 30,576

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700